



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/553,595

10/19/2005

Steven Ledbetter

07680.0023-00000

6062

22852

7590

01/08/2008

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

ROMEO, DAVID S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/553,595	Applicant(s) LEDBETTER ET AL.	
	Examiner David S. Romeo	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

an anti-TGF β antibody, an anti-TGF β receptor antibody, and soluble TGF β receptor.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

claims 6–12 and 28–34 correspond to an anti-TGF β antibody;
claims 6 and 28 correspond to an anti-TGF β receptor antibody;
claims 6 and 28 correspond to a soluble TGF β receptor.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1–6, 13–27, 35–38.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical

Art Unit: 1647

features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept is the treatment of renal conditions with a TGF β antagonist and a RAAS antagonist. The international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the species do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention.

If the species anti-TGF β antibody is elected:

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

1D11 and CAT192.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:
claims 10, 32 correspond to 1D11;
claims 12, 28 correspond to CAT192.

Art Unit: 1647

The following claim(s) are generic: 1–9, 11, 13–27, 29–38.

5 The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept is the treatment of renal conditions with a TGF β antagonist and a RAAS antagonist. The international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve
10 an inventive concept. Therefore, the species do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic
15 invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

lisinopril;

enalapril.

20 Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

25 Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

Art Unit: 1647

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP

§ 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

- 5 claim 5 corresponds to lisinopril;
claim 27 corresponds to enalapril.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1–4, 6–26, 28–38.

- 10 The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1
because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical
features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is
necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept
is the treatment of renal conditions with a TGFβ antagonist and a RAAS antagonist. The
15 international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be
considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the species
do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention.

- 20 This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic
invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as
to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

diabetic, hypertensive, renal insufficiency, renal failure, end-stage renal disease.

- 25 Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims
shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify
the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An
argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive
unless accompanied by an election.

- 30 Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of
claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the

Art Unit: 1647

limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

- 5
claims 14, 22, 36 correspond to diabetic;
claims 15, 37 correspond to hypertensive;
claim 19 corresponds to renal insufficiency;
claim 20 corresponds to renal failure;
10 claim 21 corresponds to end-stage renal disease.

The following claim(s) are generic: 1–13, 16–18, 23–35, 37–38.

- 15 The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept is the treatment of renal conditions with a TGFβ antagonist and a RAAS antagonist. The international search report filed with the present application indicates that the species cannot be
20 considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the species do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention.

- Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed
25 (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

- The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 30 Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 1647

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

5 ANY INQUIRY CONCERNING THIS COMMUNICATION OR EARLIER COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE EXAMINER SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO DAVID S. ROMEO WHOSE TELEPHONE NUMBER IS (571) 272-0890. THE EXAMINER CAN NORMALLY BE REACHED ON MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY FROM 9:00 A.M. TO 5:30 P.M. IF ATTEMPTS TO REACH THE EXAMINER BY TELEPHONE ARE UNSUCCESSFUL, THE EXAMINER'S SUPERVISOR, MANJUNATH RAO, CAN BE REACHED AT (571)272-0939.

IF SUBMITTING OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE BY FAX, APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO THE CENTRAL FAX NUMBER FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE, WHICH IS (571) 273-8300.

10 CUSTOMERS ARE ALSO ADVISED TO USE CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE PROCEDURES WHEN SUBMITTING A REPLY TO A NON-FINAL OR FINAL OFFICE ACTION BY FACSIMILE (SEE 37 CFR 1.6 AND 1.8).

15 ANY INQUIRY OF A GENERAL NATURE OR RELATING TO THE STATUS OF THIS APPLICATION OR PROCEEDING MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL (PAIR) SYSTEM. STATUS INFORMATION FOR PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS MAY BE OBTAINED FROM EITHER PRIVATE PAIR OR PUBLIC PAIR. STATUS INFORMATION FOR UNPUBLISHED APPLICATIONS IS AVAILABLE THROUGH PRIVATE PAIR ONLY. FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PAIR SYSTEM, SEE [HTTP://PAIR-DIRECT.USPTO.GOV](http://PAIR-DIRECT.USPTO.GOV). CONTACT THE ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER (EBC) AT 866-217-9197 (TOLL-FREE) FOR QUESTIONS ON ACCESS TO THE PRIVATE PAIR SYSTEM,

20 /DAVID ROMEO/
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1647

DSR
JANUARY 5, 2008